

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alcassedan, Virginia 22313-1450 www.emplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/598,678	09/07/2006	Ulf Skarby	2380-1174	8758
	7590 07/21/200 NDERHYE, PC	EXAMINER		
901 NORTH G	LEBE ROAD, 11TH F	DAGLAWI, AMAR A		
ARLINGTON,	VA 22203		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		2618		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/21/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/598,678	SKARBY ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
AMAR DAGLAWI	2618		

	AMAR DAGLAWI	2618						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 23 June 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
periods: a) The period for reply expires months from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Au no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ta	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final rejection	n.					
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b), ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TW MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).								
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date whave been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office termay reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL.	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply orig	of the fee. The appropri- inally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as					
	ience with 37 CER 41 37 must be	filed within two month	of the date of					
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(a)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).								
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>								
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b			cause					
<ul> <li>(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further core</li> <li>(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below</li> </ul>		I E Delow);						
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or		ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for					
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.						
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).								
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	1. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (	PTOL-324).					
<ol> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> </ol>			,					
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the					
7. \( \subseteq  for purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s), a) [\text{ for purposes of appeal, the proposed or how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 17-32.		ll be entered and an e	xplanation of					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>								
D. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 4.133(d)(1).								
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.								
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:								
See Continuation Sheet.								
<ul> <li>12.   Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (</li> <li>13.   Other:</li> </ul>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)							
/Duc Nguyen/	Amar Daglawi							
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2618	Examiner Art Unit: 2618							

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues with respect to claim 17, that DeMarco (US 6,047,199) fails to teach reducing the number of feeders and fails to teach a receiver diversity antenna arrangement and that simply having two antennas does not mean that there is diversity processing and DeMarco fails to teach "each RF signal received at each of the spaced apart antennas is at the same frequency and carriers the same information and that Demarco (US 6,047,199) focuses on transmission not reception. Hower, the Examiner further to given the claims the broadest reasonable interpretation inaccordance with MPEP 2111 without incorporating limitations from the specification into the claims, the recitations of "where each RF signal received at each of the spaced apart antennas is at the same frequency and carriers the same information" has not been given patenable weight. Please refer to MPEP 2111.02 the effect of preamble. The determination of whether a preamble limits a claim is made on a case-by-case basis in light of the facts in each case there is no litmus test defining when a preamble limits the scope of a claim. The limitations in preamble has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. In this case, the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness (See Kropa vs Robie), Furthermore, referring to Fig.1 and Fig.3A, the base station teaches multiple radios and the base station inloudes antennas where the base station inloudes an interface circuit and a pair of four-way combiners for combining signals from a set of radios and to which they supplied to switching circuit and to which the switching circuit contains a plurality of modes that passes radio signals from combiners to their respective feeder lines and if a fault occurs, the system provides redundancy path whereby a fault in the tower does not result in transmission loss. The bases station receives radio frequency signals and combines them using 4-way combiners and the combining occurs by combining multiple received signals of a diversity reception into a single improved signal..